

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005024626

ADDRESS

ON THE

FREE-SOIL QUESTION.

BY WILLIAM D. C. MURDOCK.

“ Qu’y-a-t-il ? ”

Since the institution of our Government it has had to encounter many difficulties, foreign and domestic. But, with one exception, they have all been met and successfully overcome by the wisdom of our statesmen, the skill and valor of our military and marine, the good sense of our people, and the patriotism of all. The exception meant is the Free-Soil question. This still remains, with all its supposed concomitant difficulties, and its threatening issues, and hangs like a baleful cloud on a horizon otherwise serene, casting a dismal gloom over the future prospects of the country.

It is obvious that at present apprehension exists to an unusual degree on this subject. And it is also remarkable that this apprehension appears to be most strongly felt—not by the young, the thoughtless, the inexperienced—but by statesmen of the highest standing for wisdom, experience, and forethought—the grey-haired, profound men of the nation. Indeed it is a circumstance that invests this subject with an almost awful interest, that this has ever been the case; that every approach to an agitation of this question, has seemed to cause dismay, the most to those who while they may be reasonably expected to feel the most intense interest in the governmental structure which they have assisted to rear and so long defend, may also be supposed to possess the best knowledge of what is most likely to cause its downfall.

Mr. Jefferson most forcibly expresses his fear of this question, involving possibly as it does the dissolution of the Union, and says mournfully, that while resting, in the evening of a life spent in the service of his country, this controversy suddenly sounded, like a fire bell in the night, to disturb his repose.

But young America has a right to enquire, and will certainly ask, what is there in the Free-Soil question that makes it so

different from all others? We enjoy the advantages, the blessings of a union formed by the wisdom of our ancestors, of States of considerable number, and great extent and resources. What is there in this question to baffle the intelligence and patriotism of the country? It has ever been the manly trait of the American people to look difficulty in the face. And when they come to take a cool and calm survey of this question—when they come to look it in the face, it may be said with confidence, they will see in it nothing whatever, either in its present position, in the circumstances by which it is surrounded, or in the feeling it has engendered, calculated to prevent or disturb a settlement, on sound principles, much less to excite fears of danger or fatal consequences to the union of these States.

A political question to be difficult or dangerous, must be so either in itself, from the difficulty of adjusting it on sound principles, or from collateral considerations tending to make such settlement impossible or difficult, or from feelings engendered by it of similar tendency: and if it can be shown that none of these is insuperable, the existence of any ground of alarm concerning it is clearly disproved.

It will be readily admitted that American statesmen should bring no provincial feeling or sectional prejudice, and do bring none, into the consideration of this or any other question. The members of our National Legislature, are sent, it is true, from every State and every district of our vast country. But it is to bring into that Legislature such a knowledge of the wants of every part, as will make legislation beneficial to every part of the country. It is not to collect conflicting, irreconcilable, sectional views, the ascendancy of any one of which would pervert legislation and render it impracticable on sound national and just principles. For this reason the sectional feelings to which I propose to advert, and whose bearing on the settlement of the Free-Soil question I propose to consider in this address, are those only supposed to exist, without the walls of Congress.

We will now therefore proceed to examine whether there are any collateral considerations connected with the Free-Soil question, which render it impossible to adjust it in a statesman-like manner on sound principles. This it will be perceived involves at once the consideration of the bearings of slavery on several subjects of great moment to the American people. Such as their religion, their political interests, the honor and reputation of their country.

In the first place we will enquire is slavery contrary to the religion of the American people. If it can be proved to be so, I for one will be willing to give it up.

Ever since the time of Numa religion, even if spurious, has been considered a necessary auxiliary to the magistrate and the statesman. How much more important must it be now, when true religion exists, that the measures of the Government should accord with its dictates?

The religion of nearly all our people is Christianity. Let us first enquire, then, is it contrary to the provisions of Christianity. What these are we can only know by consulting that volume of revealed truth on which Christianity is founded. And upon doing this, the institution of slavery will be found so plainly sanctioned by it, that it is amazing to any reflecting mind that in these days when the various Bible Societies have spread the knowledge of the Scriptures on every side, men can be found hardy enough to denounce it on the pretended authority of religion—at least the Christian religion. If there is a fact more clearly to be proved than that it is perfectly consistent with that religion as revealed in the Bible, I have not been able to discover it.

But we hear and see many things in this world calculated to call to mind, and impress it deep too, the maxim *nil admirari*—wonder at nothing.

It has been usually conceded to divines the exclusive privilege to quote Scripture. But as some of them seem to have quoted of late in such manner as to set the people together by the ears on this question, and to produce a state of things threatening the peace and order of society, it becomes the duty of the politician to claim the right to quote also on this particular subject.

If we examine the old Testament we find in Deuteronomy, chapter 20th, and Leviticus 25th, the permission to make slaves in certain cases, such as captives taken in war and by purchase. In Exodus, chapter 21st, the right is granted to sell temporarily for debt; the children born to the slave during vassalage to remain with and belong forever to the master. And if at the expiration of his term, the slave prefers to remain with them, a ceremony is provided by which he himself becomes a slave for life.

In Exodus, chapter 20th, we find certain rules of conduct given by the voice of God himself, the tenth of which enumerates the rights of the slaveholder among those the most sacred and the most dear to man, and with them defends it from the least invasion; the word servant of our version being slave in the original. In Genesis, chapter 12th and 14th, and Job, chapter 1st, we find Abraham and Job, the one called the father of the faithful, and both pronounced to be peculiar favorites of Heaven,

to be owners of numerous slaves each. So much for the old Testament. These are sufficient, but there are many other passages to the same effect.

In the new Testament we find no revocation of this, but on the contrary we see St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, in Philemon, sending back a runaway slave to his master, both being professors of religion. Also in 1st Timothy, chapter 6, we find the most awful denunciations against those who teach abolition doctrines in the name of religion, and in Colossians, chapter 3d and 4th, we find numerous injunctions both to master and slave for their conduct to each other. The book is in every man's hand: let each examine for himself.

And now let me ask what sort of a champion or even friend of the Christian religion can he be, who can, in the face of all this, denounce in its name an institution so plainly recognised and sanctioned by it. So perfectly is it identified with it, that if slavery could be proved to be contrary to the will of God, it would be difficult any longer to defend on rational grounds the religion itself.

Christianity may be pronounced emphatically the religion of the American people: for although there may be a few other religionists, they are so very few as to be only an exception to the general rule. Nevertheless as it is a true rule in argument as in war to leave no hostile fortress behind, however inconsiderable, we will advert to the rest.

The Jewish religion is in the same category as the Christian, being based, or professing to be based, on the old Testament, and therefore what has been said applies equally to it.

It is not known what number of Mahometans there may be in the country, but the Coran sanctions slavery, as any one will find by consulting it.

There are a few Pagans, Indians, within our limits who may be interested in this question, but their religion, not professing to be revealed, has no right to oppose slavery, which to do them justice, the Indians do not, and are many of them slaveholders.

I know no other religionists but Deists. I did not know until recently, that these claimed to be a sect, but have been informed that in New York and other places they have actually come to head and tail as to have organised congregations, and that there are none more inclined to abolition.

Such a crowd as theirs, not being, and not professing to be revealed, should have nothing to say about it. It should not exert anything. And then Christianity may be said to be to

religion, what point No-Point is to the geography of the Chesapeake Bay.

Their religion is purely negative. And if A among them chooses to deny that slavery or any thing else is right, and turns abolitionist, he has a perfect right to do so.

On the other hand if B denies that slavery is wrong, and turn slaveholder, he is also justified by this convenient creed, for being founded merely on opinion, it has no right to pronounce authoritatively on any point.

For suppose A should indict B for heresy before the high ecclesiastical court of his sect. In a religious court, where there is no authoritative standard, no revealed code by which to define or prove offence or adjudge penalty, all the parties, Judge included, in such a case, would be exceedingly at a loss how to proceed, what to do, and what to say.

Such a sect ought surely to be very tolerant, but nevertheless, such is the nature of man, there is none said to be more intolerant of slavery on religious grounds than this.

It seems then that this institution cannot be fairly pronounced contrary to any religion, true or false, now existing in the United States, but just the reverse.

Indeed there are conditions of life to which it would be a blessing and relief, such as that of those poor outcasts, the laboring population of Europe, and particularly of France and Great Britain, the leading abolitionist nations.

Confined as they are to certain narrow districts: brought back, if they attempt to wander, by overseers and constables; obliged to work for grinding capitalists for any wages they please to give, never more than sufficient to supply immediate necessity: liable to be turned off at any moment to beg or starve, slavery would indeed be a blessing and relief to them.

And it is a remarkable fact that Queen Elizabeth succeeded to cure the wretched pauperism of this class, in her time, by authorising the magistrates to compel wealthy individuals to take such persons and support them, making them labor in their service.

Also, we find the laboring population of France now claiming what they call the right to labor, and their Convention is said to be now engaged in settling this knotty point in the economy of their social system. How they can do it without resorting to Elizabeth's plan is more than I can see.

But it may be said that abolition is called for by philanthropy. And it has been so said by at least one distinguished philanthropist, Mr. Garrison, and many others, his pupils in the United States.

Although it is out of our way, and the course we had designed we will here stop a side, and digress so far as to examine this assertion. It is a very remarkable thing, and one I have not seen noticed in this controversy, that negro slavery owes its existence on the American Continent, and in these United States, to a distinguished philanthropist—Bartholomew de Las Casas. It is related that the good Las Casas being grieved at the condition of the Indian slaves of Spanish America, formed the plan to subject negro slaves in their stead.

To this he was moved by the following considerations: the Indians were weak and little capable of labor, the negroes strong and able-bodied; the negroes were cheerful and light-hearted, the Indians desponding and unhappy in servitude; the negroes were without the pale of Christianity, the Indians within it already.

I do not know if the philanthropists of those primitive times were as inconsiderate as those of the present. I do not know if the worthy Las Casas, having become enthusiastic concerning this project, with the occasion, too much useless trouble to his brother philanthropists of the present day, entered upon it without due consideration of all the bearings which it would have upon the people of Africa, the intended negro substitutes for the Indians.

But it is most probable that he acted considerably and understandingly—more so than his successors, who, if they had pursued the negroes of that country as given by Domingo Park, Demian, Capperien, the Landas, and others, would have perceived that there was not the least occasion for their worthy predecessor or any body else to send man-stealers to steal away the free negroes of Africa, as they have asserted; for if the latter individuals had consulted these and other authorities, they might have seen that Africa was, and probably has ever been since the time of Ham, a vast slave market, where four-fifths of the population are slaves to the rest, and constitute a great portion of their wealth. They might have seen also that no unusual hardship was occasioned to the purchased slaves themselves, by bringing them so far away to this country.

Recent Africa, according to all these writers, particularly Park, given to them, whether of party hates, generally no bigger than our countries, and continually at war with each other. The thousands of negroes taken prisoners are usually put to death being made prisoners, and therefore worthless, while they are sold upon the coast. And these slaves, together with the negroes taken by their owners, if not sent to the coast to be sold, are invariably sent to countries in

the interior, a thousand or more miles distant from home. And for this plain reason, no body would purchase them nearer, lest they might escape back.

They might have seen all this, and they might have seen also that African servitude is exceedingly harsh, the masters being barbarous, cruel, jealous, on account of the great disproportionate numbers of the slaves; invested with the despotic power of life and death, and exercising it without remorse.

Besides agricultural implements are so imperfect and agriculture so rude in that country, that famines are frequent, almost annual, during which the slaves, always stinted, suffer the most. The country also abounds with enormous beasts of prey, the lion, &c. and great serpents, to which the slave, being engaged in tillage, is much exposed, in constant dread, and frequently becomes a prey.

In short, the philanthropist of the present day, if he had taken the trouble to inform himself thoroughly on a subject concerning which he felt inclined to do and say as much as he has, would have discovered that a distinguished brother, Bartholomew Las Casas, had taken a very different and more just view of this subject: had taken a course entirely opposite to his own; and so doing, was a benefactor, not only to the Indians, but the negroes themselves. But in all this the American people have now no concern, however remote. Neither have they in the hardships which they who have set themselves "to trouble Israel," assert were encountered by the negroes on their passage to this country. The people of Great Britain, if they have any respect for their ancestors, are more interested to contest such assertions: for *their* Government would have them sent, and *their* sea captains brought them. It is true, I have for one always doubted the truth of such accounts. It seems incredible that British sea captains having bought slaves on the coast of Africa, would do anything, wilfully, to injure them, when their interest required them to be brought safely and in good condition to America, where they were to be sold. I do not believe that any but accidental hardships ever occurred, such as do now occur aboard of packets filled with emigrants coming voluntarily to this country, and which lately required and received preventive interference from our Government.

But even should such hardships have been suffered, it is evident that the slave must so much the more have hailed the approach of the humane Christian planter, who delivered him from the British slave-ship and the British sea captain, as a friend and benefactor, which in truth he was.

It appears then that philanthropy has no right to interfere

now in this question at all, lest she be called an inconsistent guide. For Mr. Garrison and his pupils, are no better authority now, than Las Casas and his adherents in former times.— They have no right to undo by abolition what he has done, and thereby subject the American people to the inconvenience of a free negro population. Philanthropy can only do this: as she brought negroes from the coast of Africa, in former times, and sold them to the American people, she can therefore now only buy them back again, or take those already free and send them back to Liberia, and that is what Christianity, the true philanthropy, is now doing.

After this digression we will now proceed to examine the bearings of slavery upon the political interests of the American people. It has been complained that it has had an unfavorable influence concerning the political interests of the non-slaveholding part of the Union: for that part has never had its due share of the highest honors of the republic, the offices of President and Vice President. That the slaveholding part has almost monopolised these honors and offices, and that its peculiar politics have thence had unequal, undue influence over the action of the Government. If this had been asserted of the State of Virginia it would have been correct. It is true that she has had an undue share of the highest honors, and that her peculiar politics have had unequal and undue influence in the Government. But it is not so clear what the institution of slavery has to do with this grievance.

One of the Presidents taken from Virginia will be admitted by all to have been the best qualified for the station of any in the country. Concerning the rest, few will deny that they were capable to do honor to the popular choice, even if there were others in the country as well, or better, qualified for the place. There are many, also, who will say that the Virginia policy, from its intrinsic merit, ought to prevail.

Why the American people have so often selected Virginians for Presidents and Vice Presidents, proceeds, probably, from the *prestige* produced by two very favorite Presidents, Washington and Jefferson, having been citizens of that State. The same partiality, directed by the posthumous influence of Mr. Jefferson, has hitherto contributed to the ascendancy of her peculiar policy. If those popular first Presidents had been citizens of Pennsylvania or New York the same partiality would have existed towards the statesmen of those States. If there is any hardship in this the rest of the South has as much, or more, to complain of than the North. Of the old Southern States, except Virginia, South Carolina alone has received this honor.

The south-west has been more fortunate. But both together have had no more, comparatively with the North, than its population entitled it to. That is if the Vice President be allowed to be, what he certainly is, equal, in honor and dignity, to the President, although not in power and patronage. But this partiality for Virginia Presidents is fast wearing away even in Virginia herself, and her citizens have not always been elected with her own consent. Time will cure this grievance, and she will at last have no more influence than she is entitled to from the talents of her representatives, her powerful vote, her central position, and her intelligent, virtuous and patriotic population—comprising in the different parts of her extensive territory the various conditions of the northern, southern and western people.

Her policy, also, the ultra agricultural, whether right or wrong, time will prostrate even among her own people. It is produced by the nature of her Constitution, restricting the right of suffrage so long to freeholders, and now to householders; it gives the ascendancy, almost the monopoly, to agriculture in her councils; it banishes, in a manner, every other class. Hence her political views are those of a State exclusively agricultural. Neither the manufacturing or mercantile classes can exert any influence, or communicate any information, in her legislature concerning their peculiar interests, identified as they are with those of agriculture itself. The same state of things exists in the new States, of both the North and the South, where there are as yet no considerable manufacturing or mercantile classes, and has no relation to slavery whatever.

Maryland, a State having similar antiquity, population, soil, climate, and slave institution as Virginia, has always opposed her policy, because she has universal suffrage, and in her councils the manufacturing and mercantile classes can be heard. Also, Delaware and Kentucky. Other southern States seem also inclined to the same course, Louisiana, Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

When population becomes more dense in the new States, they will change their policy, as Virginia will change hers, when she adopts universal suffrage, which she must do in the course of time.

With regard to the Presidency it may also be said, that no individual need covet it, from any personal considerations. We have the testimony of Washington, who filled the office under circumstances more favorable to his personal happiness than any other President ever has or ever will enjoy again. In his letter to Mr. Jefferson, entreating him not to leave his Cabinet, he speaks of his wretchedness in office. He says he

as a perfect slave to his constituents, overwhelmed with the drudgery of official duty, and, moreover, owing to the misconception of his views, and the misrepresentation of his actions, (the general detraction that has dogged the steps of every President from his time to this,) he is wretched in office. And, indeed, from these causes, little sensibility can that man have who can enjoy the Presidency. The office of Vice President is better circumstanced, having equal honor and dignity, but not enough power and patronage to excite envy. But nevertheless, the Presidency is one of those things, like matrimony, wealth, &c., of which nothing satisfies most men but personal experience. Notwithstanding that matrimony alone, has ever had any favorable testimony.

I will now proceed to examine the last remaining consideration supposed capable to warp the views of some, and prevent a clear discernment of the proper course of policy on this occasion. It is, that abolition is required to preserve the honor of the country in the estimation of other nations.

By other nations, is usually meant Great Britain and France, the two nations that dictate the sentiments and opinions, as well as the fashions, abroad. If those two nations, together with Spain, did not stand in the character of the authors and promoters of slavery on the American continent, and of the slave trade on the coast of Africa, and if they had not been the advocates of both as long as it was profitable to themselves, they might be in a situation to make taunts at us, cutting enough to those who take the opinions of others as their standard of right and their rule of conduct.

Great Britain not content with supplying slaves to her own colonies, waged a long and bloody war with Spain and France, in order to obtain, among other things, a participation in the *amanto*, or contract to furnish slaves to Spanish America, and finally obtained it in 1713, by the treaty of Utrecht. But Great Britain and France have enough to do at home, to elevate their wretched laboring population to a rank of physical happiness and respectability equal to the negroes of the United States.

I will now give here some quotations from two travellers in Great Britain and Ireland as an exemplification of this. The first is from the journal of a traveller who visited England in 1840, and published anonymously under the title of "A Summer's Jaunt across the Water." When there he went to Windsor Castle, and examined among other parts of that splendid pile the apartments of the royal dogs and horses, and here is his account of them:—An appropriation was recently

made in Parliament of *three hundred thousand dollars* to rebuild these appurtenances, and accordingly they are luxuriously large, neat, and airy. The rows of grey ponies * * * * look sleek and comfortable, as if they knew what royal fare was." Now the dogs, * * "it is worth while to glance at the * * * pet dogs. First we see their handsome portraits painted by no less a personage than the celebrated *Landseer*, the first painter in his line in the world, as they are elegantly framed and suspended in the front room of the Lodge: then go with the portly keeper into the kennel."

The second is from the "*Three Kingdoms*," by the Viscount D'Arincourt, 1845. He visited the renowned Earl of Eglington, and this is his account of the sumptuous suite of rooms in Eglington Castle, appropriated to the entertainment of the Earl's horses: "The horses are not kept in stables, but in regular apartments, preceeded by ante-rooms: nothing but looking glasses are wanting to render them complete drawing rooms, but that will be supplied some day perhaps." Surely Caligula's horse, if unambitious of the consulship, might have been here content.

Contrast this with the following account of the hovel of a peasant, by the same author: "I perceived a hut near me, which I entered—what a sad spectacle I beheld there! A family of wild-looking beings, barely clad, were there cowering over a great fire, and surveying me, as I advanced, with haggard eyes, as if I had been an emanation from the tempest, or a harbinger of the thunder. The owner of this singular den had no chair to offer me, &c." And this also of the appearance and costume of the peasantry in Scotland, the weather being unpleasantly cold: "The inhabitants of Iona bear a great resemblance to savages. Many of the children are in the primitive attire of the terrestrial paradise, except that instead of a girdle of fig leaves, they have a bundle of rags around them. A woman dressed very much after this fashion, with red hair and livid complexion, offered us shells for sale." These accounts do not appear to be a material exception to the usual mode of living of the horses and dogs of the rich, and of the laboring population of that nation, as any one may see who will take the trouble to examine the reports of the committees of Parliament on this subject. Comment is useless.

Dean Swift had scenes enough immediately around him, from which to draw materials for his story of the Houghnubs and Yahoos. And the American may say with truth, that there is no institution in his country, as in Great Britain, that depresses any part of the people below the brute creation.

With regard to the poor of France their late desperate and ferocious attempts to bring about a state of things in which they might by hard toil obtain a due portion of the fruits of the earth to support life speaks volumes as to *their* state of utter wretchedness and despair. — some of the most desperate could peril life, so in order to obtain what they call the right to labor, or be employed. — Their eagerness on this point would astonish the American negroes exceedingly. — Contrast this with the condition of the negro slaves of America. — It was said by Henry 4th of France, that he hoped to see the day when there would be a chicken in the pot of every peasant in his dominions, and this saying was considered a great mark of the benevolence of that popular King. — But his wish was perfectly utopian, he never saw that day, nor did any of his successors.

But every negro slave with us, has this, or may have it, if he pleases. — On plantations they all have their gardens if they want them, and the privilege to raise their chickens and their pigs, — and mark one thing, they are not compelled by necessity to sell them to pay rent to a voluptuous, idle, extravagant landlord. — They all have found them comfortable clothes, houses, &c. and sufficient food, as good, or nearly so, as their masters.

But let Great Britain cleanse the steps of of her policy on this continent before she undertakes to remove us on any subject. There never has been a war in which we have ever been engaged with her, and we may add, France and Spain, that she and they did not bring the tomahawk and scalping knife of the savage against the women, the children, and the aged of our people — those whom the laws of nations, received by all civilized nations, required to be treated as neutrals in war, to be saved harmless from all violence, directly perpetrated or indirectly instigated. — The escutcheon of Great Britain is stained with the blood of thousands of the fair, the aged, and the weak of a civilized, kindred and Christian people. And lately, in our threatening difficulties on the Oregon and Northeastern Boundary disputes, actions of hers, significant enough, showed that she intended to resort to the same violations of the laws of nations in the event of war. — Her leading prints abounded then with statements and suggestions that would have been at once respected and rebuked by the opinion-burgundy of the American public. — Thus Captain May 20, while enjoying the hospitality of our country, took a young girl on a brief visit to the Sierras of California, and carried her with him on his own horses, to remind them they have no wrong to do, they do and against the American people, and not to fear, that they will do so, again in the event of a war between the United States and Great Britain.

received with enthusiasm by the treacherous savages. In fact, such barbarous sentiments pervade the nation, and render its opinions of little consequence to others on such subjects as this.

Let the British statesman correct these things; let him cease to make miserable paupers by his laws of primogeniture, wretched younger sons of younger brothers: let him cease to plunder those poor outcasts by unequal taxation, and revenue laws calculated to make continually the rich richer, and the poor poorer: but until he does all this, the American statesman can meet his taunts on the subject of slavery in the words of the Divine Author of Christianity, "say not unto thy brother let me remove the mote of thine eye, and behold a beam is in thine own eye: but rather first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou wilt see more clearly to remove the mote out of thy brother's eye."

Such are the considerations supposed important enough to require consideration at this time. They appear to be only as so much rubbish, tending to obstruct, indeed, the approaches of the American patriot and the American people towards a settlement of the Free-Soil question, but not sufficient to prevent such settlement on just and statesmanlike principles. What that settlement and those principles are, is the next subject for inquiry. It may here be again repeated, that any thing like sectional or provincial feeling, whether of the North or the South, must be, and are supposed to be dismissed from the mind of the inquirer after truth on this subject, and national sentiments alone brought into action.

In such a state of mind we may proceed with hopes of success to inquire, What is a statesmanlike settlement of the Free-Soil question? The same, it may at once be answered, as a statesmanlike settlement of any other question. The statesman must take things and people as they are. He must consider the interests of the whole American people, and so arrange as to secure them the greatest good and avert the most evil.

And what are the circumstances of the American people on this subject. Slavery now exists among them throughout the country south of Mason and Dixon's line, the Ohio, and, further west, south of the 36th parallel of latitude, as far as the Rocky Mountains. It not only exists, but from considerations which will be explained, it is likely ever to exist.

On the other hand, it has been abolished north of those lines for reasons that will also be explained. And this state of things has produced another question for consideration and settlement by our statesmen. Besides the Free-Soil question, which involves the extension of slavery beyond the Rocky Moun-

tains another, is so allied to it that it is impossible to treat of or settle this without explaining and settling the other—the rendition of fugitive slaves. Leave the latter unsettled, and the North would then be but a thorn in the side of the South. It is so obvious indeed that these two subjects are so closely connected as to be imperfectly settled if settled separately, that we will proceed to examine the present state of those two questions, and explain further the principles on which they should be arranged.

On examining the subject closely we perceive with surprise that both questions are settled already in a way sufficiently statesmanlike to be satisfactory to the South, but some further action is desirable to the North on the question of rendition, although not absolutely necessary. Yes thanks to the wisdom of our statesmen both of the past and the present time these two difficult questions are already settled, as we will undertake to show in a manner that may well content the South, (the part most affected by them,) while the North has reason to seek legislation on the question of rendition, and does seek legislation on the Free-Soil or California question, without any necessity. This is surprising, for we thought the South was seeking and the North refusing legislation on the first subject, and vice versa on the other. And it removes much difficulty out of the way of a settlement of both, for the South is willing to accommodate the North by legislation on the rendition question, and Northern statesmen disposed to settle the other difficulty have only to avoid it, or let it alone, and will not thereby give such offence to their constituents as if they gave up any thing by legislative enactments.

And first concerning the rendition of fugitive slaves. It almost seems as if the wise men who framed our Constitution, foresaw the difficulty in the future on this subject, and made express provision for it. Nothing can be more complete than this fundamental law is in its protection of the rights of slaveholders. It provides first in the 4th article, 2d section, that "No person held to service in one State, under the laws thereof escaping into another shall in consequence of any law or regulation thereof be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such labor or service may be due." Secondly, in article 6th, section 2d it says: "this *Constitution* and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof shall be the *supreme Law of the land*, and the *Judges* in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." Thirdly, in article 4th section

1st. it provides that, "full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the *public acts*, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State." Fourthly, it says, article 4th, section 2d, that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." And, fifthly, it says, article 3d, section 2d, that "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law or *equity*, arising under this Constitution, &c."

Under the first provision, the owner of a fugitive slave has a right to go, without molestation, to the place where such slave is and demand him. And no State law can authorise any delay, or defeat his claim.

Under the second, he can demand him of the *Judge* or *magistrate* of the said place, or district, who is more bound to act promptly and faithfully, than if this provision was a part of the Constitution of his own State.

Under the third, the owner has a right to offer such proof of ownership as is required to establish his right of property in his own State.

Under the fourth and fifth, he can, at his option, if such Judge refuses or demurs to act, under any pretext whatever, or if the arresting officer or any individual commits any act by which he may lose his property or suffer any damage, direct or consequential, sue either of them, before the State Court or the United States Court, for the amount of the value of said slave or damages.

Nothing can be clearer. Persons may dispute his claim and sue out writs of *habeus corpus*, &c., on the ground of some State law, but those who do it, and the Judge who grants it contrary to the Constitution of the United States, are equally responsible to him for the amount of all damage received; for the Constitution provides for peremptory, prompt action on all sides, and it is the supreme law of the land, and no State law can be used as a pretext to defeat or delay its operation in this case. Neither can any law of Congress be so used. And it may be remarked that there has been legislation by Congress, and it has been pronounced unfavorable to the slaveholder. If so it is null and void so far as it conflicts with the said constitutional provisions, and thereby affects the rights of those they were intended to secure; and it cannot, any more than any State law, screen any individuals from responsibility in this case. A fair and equitable construction of the Constitution gives also similar protection to persons carrying or sending their slaves into non-slaveholding States, temporarily, otherwise absurd results would follow.

A farmer, for instance, on the frontier of Virginia whose farm is intersected by the Pennsylvania line. He lives in Virginia and has slaves; but he cannot send them into those fields lying in Pennsylvania, to bring up his horses and cows. His neighbors cannot send or carry them to bring back strays that have wandered over the line.

Again, a southern merchant having slaves, or a ship-owner whose vessel is manned in whole or in part with them, must avoid the non-slaveholding States notwithstanding that the Constitution, the supreme law of the land, subjects him only to such regulations as Congress may make for the regulation of trade and intercourse between the States; and Congress has passed no law prohibiting him to carry his slaves with him. But says the religious spirit of abolition, the constitutional provisions apply only to slaves escaping *into*, and not those escaping *on* the non-slaveholding States. And besides, tourists, the class most molested, are not merchants or men of business. All this is mere quibbling, and quibble for quibble is fair play, and God save the right. *Into* is more comprehensive than *in*, and includes it. It is the greater including the less, the whole including a part. It means more than *in*, but it also means *in*, and covers the whole ground. Besides, the word *service*, as distinguished from labor and *discharged*, appears to refer to such cases. And as to tourists, they are merchants, for they go to sell, exchange, or buy of money, bullion, bills of exchange, or gold, silver, for board, lodging, mineral waters, conveyance, and repairs, &c.; and to such extent they are merchants. And as to their being men of business, should they go in pursuit of health—what more important pursuit than that?—and should such tourist, an invalid, have a servant whose services are from long training, essential to his comfort, perhaps to his recovery, may he not take him along? And should they not be invalids, is it not a legitimate business, and one deserving the protection of the laws, if they go merely to look at the beautiful northern part of their country and dissipate by personal intercourse the national prejudices of the North and South. Perchance, and not unlikely, our southern tourist may be a bachelor, going for the purpose of winning some northern fair, such as one of those pretty girls we used to see promenading in Broadway and other places at the north—in other words, in search of a wife. What more important business than that, or more essential to happiness? And if the services of a well-trained body-servant or valet are important to his best personal appearance, and of course to his success in there any abolitionist unless a jealous rival would be inclined to contend that the Constitution or laws

of the United States, authorise or intend to authorise any interference with him in such a pursuit? The very preamble of the Constitution itself, would alone be amply sufficient to defeat such an absurd pretence. The truth is, the Constitution and laws of the United States, if fairly construed, guaranty to every citizen the common right to go as travellers, as well as men of business, unmolested in person or property of every description, to every part of the country, while they do nothing to injure the people or disturb the peace of places where they are. The abolition laws of certain States are only intended to prohibit slavery to their own citizens. Beyond this they have no operation. And if they are perverted to sanction any of those crusading attempts sometimes made against friendless southern travellers, they are beyond their legitimate sphere of action, are unconstitutional, null and void, and the aggressors are clearly liable for all damages sustained. A slaveholder is only subjected to such laws where he attempts permanent residence, and thereby becomes a citizen of the State where they exist.

Further legislation is therefore not necessary to the slaveholder on this point, but it is desirable to the non-slaveholder. Certain persons are made constitutionally responsible for the execution of certain constitutional provisions, but it requires an argument to show this, perhaps a suit to sustain it. Fundamental laws, although supreme, have seldom the minuteness of the ordinary statute law. It is due to the citizen that all laws or rules of action prescribing what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong, should be clear and beyond the possibility of dispute. And the past legislation of Congress has tended still more to mistify the subject. This want of minuteness in the fundamental law and the ambiguity produced by past legislation, may produce difficulties, excite sedition, &c., by which the peace of the North may be disturbed. It seems then desirable to the North that a plain, intelligible system should be provided by enactment, in strict accordance with the Constitution, by which this thing may be conducted. The slaveholder, also, does not desire litigation, dispute, or trouble, and would willingly accede to any plan which did not compromise his constitutional rights.

We will now proceed to consider the Free-Soil question itself, and endeavor to show, as has been promised, that it also is already settled in a statesmanlike manner, on sound principles, and that no further legislation is necessary to settle it on such principles and in such manner as ought to be satisfactory to both the North and the South. To do this it is necessary first to enquire why slavery has been abolished at the North, and why it has not been at the South? It may be answered

at once, that it was abolished at the North, partly from the disposition decidedly manifested by the American people to dispense with slave labor, whenever it could possibly be done, on account of a natural preference for free labor, whenever it was available. To prove this, we may cite the fact that slavery never penetrated the North to any extent when it was permitted there. Neither does it now exist to any extent in the healthy, upper country of the South. And partly also it has been abolished from a peculiar sentiment, or prejudice against the institution, engendered by our revolution. In exemplification of this last, I will relate something told me by an old gentleman, fond of recalling reminiscences of by-gone days. He said, that in Maryland, before the Revolution, it was the custom to have always by the fire-side, in winter time, a large tankard or mug, in rich houses of plate, in poorer, of queensware, having on it the initials of the reigning King, and called by his name. These mugs were kept filled with mulled wine, mulled cider, or apple punch, to be given warm to any visitor or visitors coming in out of the cold. At the period of the Revolution these vessels were all stamped with G. R., for George Rex, and that was their name; and they were great favorites, as they deserved to be, with all the citizens of that ancient and celebrated State.

But in politics names are things. And when the war broke out, these unfortunate mugs became suddenly as unpopular as their royal namesake. They were almost all hid away or broke. But sometimes some inconsiderate, thoughtless person would continue the ancient custom, in which case a scene would ensue which any one can see by looking at the coat of arms of the State of Virginia. In such a case, the hospitable host would advance as usual to welcome his guest, but no sooner did one of them catch sight of the George Rex steaming on the hearth, than pushing by the proffered hand, and stalking indignantly up to the fire, he spurned over the mug and all its exhilarating contents, vociferating, if not the Virginia motto, *Sic Semper Tyrannis*, at any rate something very similar in plain English. Nor did his unlucky host dare to resent such behavior, for such was the feeling of the day, that he was fain to pacify the offended party, and considered himself fortunate to escape an indictment for being a tory. A prejudice similar to this against the George Rex, arose as suddenly in the North against the institution of slavery, and doubtless for the same reason, because it was identified in the minds of the people with the Government that had always promoted it. And there being no insuperable or even considerable difficulty in the way,

abolition took place. At the same time a similar feeling existed in some degree at the South also. But the Southern people, on consideration, with the usual good sense of the American people, came to the conclusion that circumstances alter cases, and as theirs were every way different from those of their Northern brethren, common sense required they should pursue a different course. The North possessed salubrity of climate, and few slaves. The south was generally insalubrious, and had a large colored population.

At the North, white men can, at all times, conduct agricultural operations, and abolition would not cause any inconvenience to the farmer. Neither would it produce any inconvenient number of that useless, troublesome class, the free negro.

At the South, the best land, indeed the only good land in most districts then settled, were on the borders of streams or swamps, where the heat, humidity, and fertility of the soil combined to produce an atmosphere very deleterious to the constitutions of the whites; requiring the utmost care sometimes to preserve health, by avoiding exposure to the sun, the night air, &c., which laboring men cannot do.

Such could only be tilled advantageously by blacks, whose constitutions are known to suit such locations; and as free negroes will not cultivate or do, in fact, any other work, if they can help it, abolition would have destroyed Southern agriculture in a great measure. Moreover, from their excessive numbers, free negroes would have been as troublesome as the frogs of Egypt, and from their well-known peculiarity, exemplified now and then at the North, of not only not supporting the execution of the laws as the whites do, but of resisting their execution on one of their own color, rendering it impossible to make of them republican citizens, seditions of a serious character would be likely to arise in some places if the slaves were released from their habits of subjection to their masters.

For all these reasons the South acted wisely to avoid abolition, and the tendency that way has been arrested. I may here observe, in confirmation of their conclusion, that modern Italy presents a striking proof of the necessity which some countries have for slave labor, to render them subservient to the use of man. The district now called the Maremma was once, when slave labor existed there, in the time of the Romans, a well cultivated, healthy and populous district, containing many large cities, Rosella, Saturnia, Populonia, and others. It is now almost uninhabited and uninhabitable; its surface, undrained by the modern Italian, starving and miserable as he is, as our own free negro, has become an immense morass, emitting a

baletul malaria which renders it a pestilential nuisance to the surrounding countries.

Such is a brief statement of the state of the slave question, both past and present, and such it is likely, from the same immutable causes, ever to continue. The American statesman should, therefore, act for circumstances as they are, and not by any useless, vain efforts, which can have none but a mischievous effect, disturb a state of things established by the good sense of our ancestors.

From all this we may gather that statesmen of the present day, disposed to settle the Free-Soil question on sound principles, have to consider the following things in making regulations concerning the unsettled territory.

One is to exclude slavery from such localities and latitudes where, from the nature of the soil, climate, and the disposition of the American people, they know it must be abolished. This measure, apparently harsh to the slaveholder, is really beneficial, as it prevents him from losing his property.

The other is, to permit it where it can exist, and is necessary to the cultivation of the soil and the full development of the agricultural wealth of the country.

And, to examine the course of the Government, we find it has acted on this principle. It has been excluded from the Northwest Territory at the instance of the South itself, because in that, from its northern latitude, it could not have kept its ground. It has been likewise excluded, for the same reason, from the country north of latitude 36°, beyond the Mississippi, but permitted south of that latitude, because necessary there, and capable of being maintained.

It has been excluded from Oregon; but as nothing has been legislated on the subject regarding California, it now stands permitted there; for slaveholders can go like other citizens, when not forbidden, to any part of our territory, if they please, on consideration, to run the risk. And as this last Californian difficulty constitutes the Free-Soil question of the present time, and thus lies at present in a position agreeable to those sound principles on which the Government has all along acted, and which seem to have satisfied all parties, I think it will be seen that the whole Free-Soil question is, as I have asserted, already settled in a statesmanlike manner, on sound principles.

But it has been said that part of California lies north of the 36th north latitude, and therefore some interference is required to make the case coincide with the principles of sound policy, but nevertheless, such is not the case.

It has been shown that the necessity for slavery south of lati-

tude 36° , and west of the Rocky Mountains, results from natural causes, the great heat of the climate, &c. Now, it is a fact, that on the western coast of this continent the climate is warmer further north by as many degrees as six at least, than on the eastern side. The 42° in California is as sultry, quite, as the 36° degree in Missouri. The same thing occurs on the old continent. The north of China is colder than the corresponding latitudes of Europe. And even on the coast of islands no larger than Great Britain it is the same thing.

For this there is a natural and immutable cause, well known to naturalists. In the north temperate zone the northwest is the prevailing wind, produced by the heat of the sun traversing the face of the earth from east to west. The dense air comes generally from the northwest to meet it, and always affects the climate to make it colder or warmer according to circumstances. If it passes over the cold summits of mountains like the Cordilleras or Rocky Mountains, it makes it colder east of them. But if it comes from the ocean, as on the coast of California, it brings humidity and warmth. So that, to leave the Californian question as it is, would not be any violation of those principles of sound policy on which the Government has all along acted, but would be, on the contrary, in strict accordance with them.

The abolitionist will hence perceive that the wind is against him in any attempt he may make to introduce abolition into California, and so we believe would be the tide of public opinion.

He will also perceive that the same gales that would infallibly blow abolition out of any part of California, have also, on the other hand, expelled slavery from all the country north of the 36° degree, and west of the Rocky Mountains. He will, therefore, I hope and believe, rest content, and not complain of a dispensation of Providence on the whole most favorable to him.

But should he do otherwise : should he attempt and prevail to persuade the statesmen of the North to use their numerical preponderance in the National Legislature to violate the principle on which the Government has all along acted : to disregard the prompting of national feeling, and in place thereof institute the provincial ; to do an act calculated justly to offend the slaveholder, for he will see that his Government has gone out of its way to exclude him, without cause, from participation in the advantages of emigration—let him be assured of one thing, that the South will not gratify him, if that is what he wants, so far as to divide the Union on so paltry a question—on

so paltry a remnant of a once great question. The Southern people will never divide the Union nor suffer it to be divided, as long as they have rifles and swords to defend it.

No, the South will pursue a more manly, a more patriotic course. The South will bide its time. It will wait patiently until better feeling arises at the North. Until dire fanaticism has subsided. It knows that neither the people of Oregon or California will be long content to send, at great expense, around or across the continent, for the tobacco, the cotton, the sugar of the South, when, if slavery was allowed in California, they might have it so much cheaper at home. It knows and believes that the first act of sovereignty of California would be to right this question, if it should be thus put wrong. And thus believing it, will in the meantime, rest content with the commercial advantages derived from a valuable market for its productions, however unnaturally produced, on the western coast of this continent.

Before leaving this subject, it is necessary, to complete the argument, to advert to a difficulty which seems to be supposed to exist, and to require legislation.

It seems to be supposed, that in consequence of the transfer of New Mexico and California to us, the old governments that were previously established in those countries have ceased to be, and therefore, immediate action by Congress is required to supply their place. Such is not the case. By the laws of nations, there can be no interregnum in such cases. The same government that existed and to which the inhabitants were entitled, while a part of the country making the cession, would continue in force, until superseded by legislation of the new government receiving such cession, so far as is necessary to the proper government of the said inhabitants; and so far as the constitution or laws of said pre-existing government do not conflict with the existing laws, constitution, and rights of the receiving country, or any of its citizens. Hence in California and New Mexico the legislature, if any existed previously, would continue to be appointed or elected in the same manner as before, unless Congress should direct otherwise. The same laws also would remain in force with the aforesaid qualification. Also, public officers, governors, judges, and magistrates, would be appointed in the same or a similar manner. If they had been previously appointed by the executive of Mexico, their appointment would be invested, of course, in the executive of the United States. The circumstance of those provinces being once conquered states does not alter the case. The treaty, by acknowledging the rights of Mexico, abolishes the military

government, and acknowledges and restores the rights of the inhabitants; and they return to them so far as they do not conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States. I have never seen it asserted that they conflicted with any laws of this country, but it has been said, that they do conflict on one point with the Constitution; that the President has no power to appoint their officers by our Constitution, and, therefore, they must remain destitute of any executive, unless Congress should interfere and authorise such appointment. This opinion is also, it appears to me, unfounded. The Constitution, article 2d, section 2d, empowers the President to appoint all officers whose appointment is not otherwise provided for, which shall be established by law. It also makes, article 6th, *all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, the supreme law of the land*, equally with the common statute law. And it has been shown, that the treaty of peace with Mexico, by the laws of nations, involved and authorised the appointment of the officers of New Mexico and California, in the same or a similar manner as before. Then, that treaty, being the *law of the land*, does vest the appointment of such officers in the President, until otherwise provided by Congress.

Again, it has been doubted whether the laws of those provinces authorise the immigration of slaveholders to them, with their slaves. In answer to this it may be repeated, those pre-existing laws only have force where they do not conflict with the constitutional, legal, and other rights of the American Government and people. They come in as territories, and no territory has any right to exclude any citizen of the United States, on penalty of confiscation, or rather deprivation of property, without compensation: such property being recognised by the Constitution itself. It is doubtful even if such territorial law should be confirmed by act of Congress,—it is doubtful if any act of Congress itself would not be constitutionally null and void in such a case. To say to any American citizen you shall not go to such parts of the national territory, on penalty of deprivation of property, is a very harsh, a very high-handed proceeding, only to be justified by necessity to promote the good and ultimately preserve the property of the citizen himself, as has been herein explained before.

But such an act is, after all, of doubtful constitutionality. The article authorising regulations for the public territory, and to provide for the general welfare, may possibly, by strained construction, authorise it, but after all, it is exceedingly doubtful if it does not require the action of the sovereign power, in convention, to legalise such an act.

It is true that Congress, acting under the constitutional authority to receive new States, has frequently made it a condition of such reception, to adopt abolition. But it is obvious that the validity of such abolition proceeds from the act of the people of the new State, in their convention. It is doubtful, exceedingly, if any law of Congress, or of any State legislature, to this effect is not null and void unless authorised. No legislation seems then necessary on this account, and therefore, the whole subject of the Free-Soil, or rather free-negro soil question, may be pronounced to be, as has been said before, already settled satisfactorily in every particular.

We will now proceed to examine whether there are any feelings or prejudices at the North or South, either existing previously or engendered by the subject, strong enough to obstruct a settlement of this question in a statesmanlike manner, or rather, as such settlement has been shown to have been made already, to disturb it. Such sectional prejudices in a country are very potent for evil, and similar, though not so malignant, as those between nations; and, to see the mischief produced by such prejudices, we must look at their operation in this case, where there is nothing to obstruct their sway.

Look at the long and bloody wars between England and France, two nations separated by a narrow channel very little wider than the Chesapeake bay. What misery must have been produced in the many hundred years during which they have swayed the councils of both countries.

But even in the same country in Europe, we see in every province dissimilarities in the language, manners, and appearance of the people so remarkable that they must infallibly produce sectional prejudices such as would render a Government like ours, founded on public opinion, impracticable, if they were not all subservient to some central influence, as that of their metropolis. But how different is it in our country: throughout its vast extent how strikingly homogeneous is its population! It is true, I have seen persons who have said they only want to catch a glimpse of any of our people to tell exactly what State he is of. But I never myself could boast of such discernment, although living all my life where persons can be seen from every section of the Union. To me they seem as much alike, almost, as the coinage of our mint, partaking generally, in a most remarkable degree, of the same characteristics.

The striking similarity of our people, together with the frequency of communication between them, produces, of course, a freedom from sectional prejudice that is remarkable, and not

only removes many difficulties from the path of the statesman in the settlement of domestic questions of policy, but, also, destroys all those centrifugal tendencies which might lead eventually to a dissolution of the Union.

A very distinguished statesman of our country from the North, in a late speech, alluding with satisfaction to the freedom of the North from sectional views, applied happily the quotation—

Where is the North? at York, 'tis on the Tweed;
In Scotland, at the Orcades; and there
At Nova Zembla, or the Lord knows where.

With equal truth, may the South be pronounced invisible and hard to find,* if sought for the purpose of discovering sectional or disunion sentiments. In all questions of difficulty, such as the Free-Soil or rendition question, the popular sentiment and the popular language are, if we cannot settle it now, we will wait till we can settle it: if we cannot settle it the right way, we will settle it the wrong way, and trust to Providence to bring things right at last. And I will put it to all, if such a disposition does not now and has not always prevailed in such cases. It is as rare for an American to think of disunion as a remedy for political evils, as it is for him to contemplate suicide, to cure the ills of life. In illustration of this, I will relate something *apropos*, that occurred sometime ago. There was once a time when he “whose head is now old and some deal grey,” will remember well enough, when our down-cast brethren had not brought their manufactures to the perfection which they at present possess. The manufacturers of those days had just commenced a new thing, and could not be expected to exhibit all the skill of their successors of the present times, when they have the benefit of long experience. Hence those first attempts possessed, (if all is true that has been said of them,) more proof of ingenuity than of adaptation to the purposes for which they were apparently designed. This was said to have occasioned much inconvenience and vexation to their Southern customers. For instance, it was said a Southerner would sometimes buy a handsome bureau of a pedlar. It was perfect, externally, and the purchase, at a low price, offered much self-congratulation to the fortunate owner. But on trial it proved most mysteriously hard to open. The key was turned repeatedly: the handles were almost pulled off. Nothing would do. The bureau continued more obstinate than any oyster that ever vexed a gourmand. At length, in despair, a back board was ripped off, when behold, it appeared at once, there was a very good reason why it did not open, and it was discovered that the maker was something of a wag. Again, many

a Southern sportsman, it was said, who aimed at a turkey or fat buck, would find that his trusty rifle, however well primed, would not make fire. And on picking the capital flint, bought the other day of a pedlar, he discovered that the manufacturer was as great a philanthropist as Mr. Garrison himself, and never designed his flints to cause damage to any man or any creature. His wife also, who had prepared a dessert, would find that the custard or the pudding had more the flavor of pine wood than any thing brought from the Indies, notwithstanding she had spiced it liberally with one of those beautiful nutmegs, bought of the same man.

Such were some of the stories then afloat at the South, and Southern men were more disposed to be indignant then than now, when called upon to encourage Northern industry.

On the other hand, the North had similar stories against the South, and thought it equally hard to be required to patronize the agricultural productions of the South. It accused the South and Southwest, among other things, of raising or curing hams of a very curious description. Doleful stories were told, that many a Northern lady taking her seat at table, with her friends, well pleased that she was about to treat them to an elegant Virginia ham, when alas! the said ham was found impenetrable even to the keen edge of Rogers' best steel. In fact nothing but a saw could possibly open it, inasmuch as it was made of the identical material that has furnished a celebrated *soubriquet* to a celebrated President of the United States.

They have, however, come to a better understanding since those days of mutual banter, and now all confess they get the worth of their money. But more was said then about disunion than now. And I remember being in a very pleasant party of gentlemen at dinner, when with wine the subject of politics was broached as usual. There was present a young lawyer, and he, whether he was destitute of the patriotism which distinguishes his profession, or whether moved by the love of talk, or whether the Madeira did not suit his constitution, for some reason or other, professed disunion sentiments, and began to expatiate on the benefits that would result to the South from a dissolution of the Union. There was present also a gallant officer of the Navy, from the Eastern Shore of Maryland, who anticipated the rest, and immediately lugged out in defence of the star-spangled banner. The conflict was not so unequal as might be supposed. The lawyer talked remarkably well, but the sailor was full of nautical readiness and humor. The lawyer abounded in argument and sarcasm, but the sailor had ever ready some odd reply, that foiled him, and raised the laugh at his expense.

The scene was rich. At length, the lawyer, baffled but not inclined to join in the merriment, ended with: I'll tell you what, you may say what you please about the benefits of the Union, but some of those Northerners are very bad people. Not long ago a Yankee pedlar came to the house of a neighbor of mine when he was away from home, and cheated his wife, by selling her wooden cucumber seed. At least, they never came up. Now, suppose he had served you so, what would you have done? Done, said Jack, with a comic earnestness that is indescribable, what would I have done? I'd have gone to *his* house when *he* was away from home, and cheated *his* wife. But I would not dissolve the Union. This ended the controversy, for all present, the lawyer included, were constrained to join in the roar of laughter that followed this sally.

But the best way to prove the good feeling of the two different sections of the great Republic towards each other and towards the Union, and their disposition to accommodate differences, would be to relate what each has heretofore done, relinquished, and suffered for their common country. Indeed, the people of both parts have given proof of attachment to each other, and to their whole country, which will remain long forgotten. Of these proofs the South has given as many as the North, of the active kind, and more of those which are passive, for this reason only, that peculiar circumstances have made it necessary for the South to endure more, having been more exposed to molestation than the North. As it is one purpose of this address to adduce instances from the past conduct of both sections, to show the difficulty, or rather impossibility, of dissolving the Union, and at the same time to facilitate the settlement of all disputed questions in general, and those pending in particular, I will endeavor to recount them, and will commence with the South.

In the first place the South has given active proofs of attachment to the North by marching to its defence against invasion. During the war of the Revolution a regiment from Maryland saved the honor of the day and the reputation of our arms, in the battle fought on Long Island in defence of New York. In the open field it defeated several veteran British regiments, in turn, cutting to pieces the Welsh Fusiliers. Nor did it retire until the general retreat of our army enabled the enemy, by an attack in front, rear, and one flank, to force it off the field, with the loss of two-thirds of its number. And, afterwards, the Southern horse, drawn from Virginia and Maryland, whose exploits have given Cooper a foundation for one of his truly national stories, and the Southern rifles, rendered eminent services. Also, the

Delaware, Virginia, and Maryland Lanes rendered good service in every battle at the North, until they were ordered South to assist the gallant troops of the Carolinas and Georgia to check the progress of the British army in that quarter.

And next during the last war, thousands marched from the South and South-west to defend the Northern frontier against the British and their Indian allies. Such are the active proofs furnished by the South. We will now recount what sacrifices it has made—what inconveniences, vexations, and grievances it has endured, does now, and, we believe, ever will endure unless sufficient good feeling should arise at the North to do away the necessity.

The first sacrifice of the South on the altar of patriotism was one for which the North does not give her any credit; nevertheless, reflection will satisfy that it was of considerable magnitude. In apportioning the representation in the National Legislature, the North required that there should be no representation of a part of the Southern people, equal to two-fifths of the slave population. The North demanded this on the ground that slaves do not vote, and, therefore, there should be no representation for them. If the voting population, or number of voters, was the basis of representation the conclusion would have been perfectly legitimate. But such is not the case. The constituent body is left liable to vary in every State, and in none does it embrace the whole white population.

Women, and children, and youths under age do not vote in any State. In some, none but freeholders, and in many it was the case at that time. In the greater number a property qualification of some kind was then required. Hence would be the result that population ought to have been the standard, because it is invariable, and because it is the best index of wealth, and the stake which each State has exposed to be legislated on. Nevertheless, all we want is to have representation so adjusted as to secure good legislation, and the present apportionment is extensive enough for that. Therefore the South acted wisely to make such sacrifice.

Next are the vexations the South has to encounter from the conduct of Northern abolitionists of the unscrupulous aggressive character. Such persons have ever been troublesome to the South, but of late their proceedings have been such as to be almost intolerable. Southern people cannot visit the Northern part of their own country without going in a way to which they are unaccustomed. Sometimes ill health, more than curiosity, makes a visit to the North desirable or necessary. In this case the services of a slave to whom they are accustomed

are indispensable: but invalids cannot avail themselves of them without subjecting themselves to harassing vexations from abolitionists of this sort. Every thing that inhospitable malignity and ingenuity can devise is done to disturb their peace. Sometimes a most plain provision of the national Constitution, for the rendition of fugitive slaves, has been rendered nugatory by the persevering cunning of such persons, and thereby the invalid is deprived of the services of a valuable slave, trained up with care to perform services necessary to the comfort of the aged and the sick. But abolitionists do not always, it seems, come off with flying colors in such cases. The last case I have heard of was that of a young lady, who having occasion to go to the North, took with her, as a servant, a young free negro girl. Arriving at the destined place, a certain Northern city, she took rooms in a boarding house. The next day a man, genteely dressed, (but surely no American,) abruptly entered her sitting room, and rudely demanded to know if she had not with her a *young colored lady*, whom she held as a slave.

The lady replied that she had with her a young colored girl, but that she was free and a hired servant. The man expressed his belief, notwithstanding, that the girl was a slave, and said she must be delivered up. The lady referred him to the girl herself, who happened then to enter the room. The man accosted the girl, with respect, and asked if she was not held as a slave. The girl denied that she was. The man then said he was sure she was too much in fear of her mistress to contradict her, but that he would soon show her how many friends she had in that place, who would protect her. The lady begged he would use no violence, as the girl was certainly free. The abolitionist flounced out to collect the usual mob. He soon marshalled in front of the house all his odoriferous forces, "black spirits and white, blue spirits and grey." The girl was about to be seized under a writ of habeas corpus, to be carried to a place of security, all the time protesting she was free, when news of the affair reached the ears of some of those noble sons of the North, those true gentlemen, who are ever as ready to rescue helpless Southern travellers, men or women, from the violence of abolitionists of this stamp, as they are to lead the gallant volunteers of the North to the defence of the South, and they interfered, and soon put a stop to proceedings equally unmanly, inhospitable, and ridiculous.

But these are not all the vexations which have harassed the South, and made its patriotic endurance to shine as gold tried in the furnace.

The institution of the jury trial has been desecrated and per-

verted by prejudice in such a manner as justly to lose the confidence of Southern people on this subject. Instance: the case where a Southern man, applying for rendition of a fugitive slave according to law and the Constitution and being refused by a Northern judge, contrary to both, took away his slave by force. He was indicted by the grand jury of the county where the slave was harbored, for kidnapping, although of such an offence he could not possibly have been guilty, not even constructively, if the intention constitutes the crime. He is demanded of the Executive of his own State, and given up according to the Constitution—and nothing but a transfer of his case to a United States Court could possibly have saved him, and prevented his conviction of a crime for taking possession of his own property, when illegally withheld from him by a most daring violation of the Constitution—the supreme law of the land. For doubtless, the county that could produce such a judge and such a grand jury, could also have produced a petit jury of a similar stamp to consummate their work.

But more yet. The incendiary proceedings of abolitionists, not content with prostrating all law, with outraging every right of Southern men in the wide field of the North, have invaded the South itself, and rendered it necessary, by their guilty perversion of the post, to desecrate that institution also, although held sacred by every free Government when consistent with the preservation of the public weal. By means of incendiary publications they were spreading such disaffection among the slaves and free negroes in some places at the South, as not only to arrest all steps which Southern men were taking for the amelioration of their condition, but to make the present condition of both actually much worse than it ever was before. Every one acquainted with Southern life on plantations knows with what ease they can be managed by a person who understands the negro character, provided no disaffection exists. Always, in such cases, I have known plantations to be the abode of much happiness to both the whites and slaves. A pleasing, oriental, patriarchal state exists, cemented by mutual regard, confidence, and good will, and it constitutes the happiness of Southern life.

But let a contrary spirit of insubordination arise among the slaves, whether from the efforts of abolitionists, or any other cause, and what a change takes place. Even Northern men must perceive, that on large plantations order and regularity must be preserved, as necessarily as on board a ship at sea, and that any refractory behavior must be at once put down. To spread disaffection among slaves is to make them unhappy, to bring them directly into collision with their masters, and to

give the latter also unhappiness and trouble. It takes from the slaves the pleasant motives of fidelity, obedience, and that affection to their masters for which negroes are remarkable, when well affected, and substitutes the unhappy motive of fear of punishment. It makes him not only unhappy, but perchance unfaithful and disposed to escape away. In such cases, distrust is excited against those who remain, and for every one who escapes, two at least are sold away, who might, but for this, have lived and died at home.

But not only has it been necessary to desecrate the post, but another institution, or rather right, of far more importance. The right of petition. This, also, it has been found necessary to curtail in consequence of certain abolitionists. And as this involves a grievance of far more importance to the North than any yet mentioned, I have reserved it for the last of the list, with the intention to dilate upon it as I think its importance demands. I wish to be understood. The infringement of the post and of the right of petition, were doubtless necessary measures. But of that necessity the South has reason to complain.

It is true, that it has been found necessary in self-defence to violate those institutions, owing to their perversion to purposes of mischief by abolitionists of the mischievous sort. I am inclined to think, however, that every gallant Southerner will consider the evil to which I allude of greater magnitude than any averted by this measure. It has been said by a sage, "in measures of government good cannot be universal, it can only be predominant." But in this case the evil predominates. And I feel sure, that every gallant Southerner believes an evil has been inflicted on the South calculated to make all Southern men pause, and consider whether it is not heavier than that it was intended to avert, great as it is.

It is this, that it is calculated perhaps to bring Southern statesmen and Southern men into an ungracious position, and into disfavor with our pretty countrywomen, the fair ladies of the North. And when it is considered that the North must furnish, numerically, two-thirds of the ladies of the country; and that they possess equally with the daughters of the sunny South that gift of heavenly beauty which has gained for them all the reputation of the *prettiest women in the world*; then this view of the subject must be admitted to have been always of the greatest importance.

To be put to the ban by the fair of the North is to be banished and barred from the good graces of two-thirds of the beauty and female attractions of this great country! This circumstance

would have involved at all times a severe grievance to the South. But when we think of the peculiar mode in which American beauty has chosen of late to reward American talents, patriotism, and valor—when we remember that General Taylor, at his late reception in Donaldsonville, Louisiana, was invited to kiss, and did kiss, all the beauty in the place; when we remember that Mr. Clay experienced a similar good fortune in one of the Northern cities, (Philadelphia, I think,) at least so said the papers, and although both of these eminent patriots doubtless deserved such reward, yet, nevertheless, it was impossible to read either account without feelings of intense envy; when we think of all these things, if they do not cause us deeply to anathematise Mr. Garrison, the philanthropist, who originally invented or discovered modern abolition, and is therefore responsible for all its subsequent misdeeds, at least we cannot refrain to exclaim in the words of the poet—

Sweet is the song of birds—the voice of woman,
The voices of children, and their earliest words,
But sweet, Oh! pass—sweet beyond be—

to hear that Mr. Garrison had crossed the Styx, to discuss and settle with Bartholomew de Las Casas the philanthropy of abolition.

This is a subject which we really cannot dismiss without some further effort to discover, and point out a way, by which this mischance may be mitigated, or averted to the South. It has been a long time, at least twenty years, since I was North of Mason and Dixon's line, but I then saw women there with whom to be captivated was a thing of course.

A Southern gentleman writing home in those days would have to reverse Casar's dashing letter, and write, I grieve I saw—I am conquered. And to be disenchanted, he would feel to be as impossible or impracticable as abolition itself. The Northern locality was suddenly invested with a new interest. A conservative course was felt impossible. Ultraism was the order of the day. And if he could not succeed to persuade the Northern fair to take him, or for better, for worse, he was fain to beat a speedy retreat, to interpose the attractions of Southern beauty as an antidote to the peasing poison he felt coursing his veins.

But the Southerner did not always sigh in vain, and I have known fair abolitionists of the North endued with that charming inconsistency considered by some women's greatest charm, to consent to come to the South, and not only set a bright example as tender wives and mothers, but as most kind mistresses of plantations.

But perhaps, gentlemen of the South, you have not all been to the North, and as we desire to unite the whole South in an effort to extricate it from the sad dilemma in which it lies, we must endeavor to give you as graphic a description as possible of what we have seen, that you may enter fully into our sentiments. You have read Cooper's story of the Pioneers: if so, must have admired Elizabeth Temple, the heroine, and her no less interesting friend, Miss Grey. You must also have read Miss Leslie's delightful new novel, and fallen in love with her charming heroine, Amelia Cotterel, if you have a spark of romance. I can tell you, then, that these are not fictitious characters, but drawn from real life, as any one may see who will make a tour to the North.

But I will endeavor to furnish you on the spot with ocular demonstration, which is better than the most glowing description. Look, here is the June number of Godey's Lady's Book. Look at this engraving of "one of our contributors." Those fair Northerners have not only beauty in perfection, but genius and talent. Take a good look at her. Did you ever see anything more beautiful, more lovely, at the South. And how modest and gentle she is. She looks as Eve might have looked when she first opened her eyes on the beauties of Paradise; timid, but admiring the scene and gratefully adoring Him who made such a beautiful world. Who "one of our contributors" is, whether she is Fanny Linton or Grace Greenwood, or—in short, the tantalising editor refuses to give her sweet name, but only says she is young and single, and one of those gifted ladies whose pens have so delightfully beguiled away the monotony of country life at the South. But here, again, is the September number of Graham's Magazine; look at this, over the name of Angila Mervale. I have seen this lady, at least her exact counterpart. She was a fair Bostonian. See what an arm and hand she has, what a neck and bust, what a graceful posture. And then the face divine. I wish we could see her foot and ankle, my favorite points; but if she is the lady I mean, they are perfect. But take her as she is, without counting the interesting story connected with her name, and what bachelor among you can look at Angila Mervale without finding his thoughts revert at once to that ceremony which deserves, *par excellence* to be called *the* ceremony, and which we have all, at sometime of life, at least, thought more interesting and desirable than the inauguration of President and Vice President of the United States.

But here is another. Here is Godey again, the July number plate of fashions. I have seen the original, or counterpart, of

that portrait on the left, she who leans pensively on one arm while the other is thrown gracefully back. She resides, or did reside, in New York. Did you ever see a face that united such harmony and regularity of feature and delicacy of coloring, with such piquancy of expression. And then her dress, so simply elegant, cunning baggage, she seems to know well enough we are regarding her admiringly all the time she pretends to be listening to her fair companion.

But here again, is another, in Godex's book for June plate of fashions, she on the right with the shade erect. I have seen her also, a fair Philadelphian. What an exquisite face, what becoming attire, what graceful movement. We fancy elysium in the promenades of Philadelphia where tread such pretty feet. And saw you ever a more tempting mouth. It is a perfect rosebud, and she holds it up, too, so temptingly, as if she was coming up to give Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Webster, Mr. Benton, or some other veteran statesman, the same delicious greeting which she gave, perhaps, so lately to Mr. Clay: while she glances at the looks of Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Reverdy Johnson, Mr. Moore, Mr. Mason, Mr. Andrew Stewart, and many others, besides Mr. Murdock, all evidently worthy of the same reward, but whom she deems too young yet, or too single, to be trusted to receive it.

These are the few of these beautiful pictures of which I have seen the originals, or the exact counterparts, among our fair countrywomen of the North. But I suppose they are all portraits of the ladies of Philadelphia, where those excellent Magazines are published, although it is not so said: certes, there is not any occasion there for an artist to draw upon his fancy.— And now turn your eyes, you who have the opportunity, towards those galleries and lobbies, filled with the fair daughters of both the North and South, where so many come daily, as they say to hear the debates, but really we suspect to flirt with the bachelor members and gallant married men whose wives are indulgent or out of the way, and say if they do not present a most beautiful, animated and perfect confirmation of all I have said and all I have told you.

Suppose some of such gems of beauty and loveliness to have turned their attention to politics, as American women are apt to do, and suppose they should get wrong on the subject of abolition which, being on the wrong side of the Ohio and Mason and Dixon's line, they are sure to do; and suppose them collected in some elegant boudoir at the North or Northwest, and have laid their pretty little heads together to draw up and send a petition to Congress. It is "writ with a crow quill on gilt

edged paper," perhaps with all the pathos of which any one of the fair contributors to the aforesaid magazines might be capable. It is read, and excites deep feeling among the fair auditors. Numerous sweet voices, all talking at once, make music more delightful than any concert of birds. Each is eager to sign, and with bright eyes suffused with tears, and bosoms heaving with emotion at the recital of imaginary woes, ruby lips breathe soft orisons for success. It is sent to Congress: and then, oh! finale most unromantic for such a scene, it must be thrown sternly and ignominiously on the table, there to remain. No committee of correspondence can be appointed, composed of Southern bachelors or gallant married men, to examine it, and, if stern political necessity requires its rejection, to soften such rejection, and propitiate by compliments, excuses, &c. None to enquire, respectfully, whether the continuance of the favor and good graces of the fair petitioners is to be expected after such rejection: and if the answer is *No!* no anxious committee of conference can be appointed, of the same materials, to ascertain, by personal interview, if it is the *no* that means *yes*, which ladies sometimes use. None of these things can be done, but a paper, gemmed, perhaps, with the tears (however needlessly shed gallantry will never enquire) of our pretty countrywomen, is thrown ignominiously on the table, there to be huddled with papers emanating from all sorts of places and all sorts of people.

Perhaps something might be done to mitigate the unqualified hardship of the position of Southern statesmen and Southern men. It is true, that statesmen are not at liberty to use the words of honest old Sir Geoffry Osbaldistone. "It shall never be said there was but one woman at Osbaldistone Hall, and she died for want of not having her will." Public trusts and public duty require a spirit more unyielding. But surely gallantry might provide some fitting receptacle, some delicate urn or ornamented vase, fragrant of roses, to hold these interesting effusions of our fair countrywomen, and propitiate their authors and signers. Commending this subject to the due consideration of every gallant Southerner, we will now pass on to the relation of what has been done and endured by the North, for the sake of the Union and our common country.

It has been observed already that the North has not been called upon, like the South, by uncontrollable circumstances, to endure and make sacrifices for the sake of the South. Had such been the case, there are signs of devotion "in her every look and act" to show what would then be her demeanor. Has not the North ever been to the South like a fond and devoted sister? And as such a sister will deck her favorite with the

brightest ornaments and the choicest attire, so has the North showered upon the South, "as from an urn," the honors of the Republic, wayward and erroneous as she sometimes protests the South to be. So that the latter begins to ask, Why is it ever thus? Why will you not let me do something for you; your own great and distinguished sons? They have given ample proofs, in your State councils, of the highest order of statesmanship; they have made your land to smile and blossom as the rose—a very Eden; they have given ample proofs in our National Councils of the same qualifications, of the highest talents and the purest patriotism. Why will you not consent to crown them with the chaplet of political honors, the testimonials of our mutual favor.

Even the molestation to which the South is so much exposed, and of which she so much complains, appears to proceed in a great measure from the well-meant, but mistaken, efforts of Northern men to benefit the South. For, I believe in my heart, that not one moment could the abolitionist stand or find favor at the North, after our Northern brethren cease to believe that his efforts are meant and calculated for our express benefit. I believe in my heart, that could a majority of our fellow-citizens of the North be made to understand our peculiar difficulties on this subject, our time of trial and of trouble would at once be ended, so far as it proceeds from the misconduct of individuals among them. And now, if we proceed to recount what the North has done for the South, we must recite a catalogue of benefits far longer than this address can admit or contain.

The North has been to the South like Indian or Peruvian mines of wealth. Even without the sphere of the National Councils, her assisting capital and the genius of her great men, her Clinton, Whitney, Fulton, and Morse, have quadrupled Southern wealth. And how much do we not owe, and how much more might we not owe, if we would, to the counsels of Northern statesmen, trained up as they are in those State governments which have amply shown they know full well "to scatter plenty over a smiling land." On this subject we could dilate *ad infinitum*; we could point to many distinguished individuals—we could cite numerous instances and facts. But, alas, this whole subject is greatly mingled with party feuds and animosities, and as we are unwilling, on the present occasion, to excite in the least degree party prejudice, we must turn to another

Whenever the South has required military assistance the North has promptly responded. During the last war with Great Britain, hostilities were very transient at the South,

and with the imperfect mode of communication then existing, before steamboats and railroads were in use, they were generally over before assistance could arrive from the North. Nevertheless, the attendance at the annual festival in Baltimore, in memory of the repulse of the British army, of a band of defenders from Pennsylvania, now, alas, but few, shows that some were able to arrive in time.

But if we take a retrospective glance to the war of the Revolution, we will see a different scene. We will behold a scene far different if we look back to that period of time, when all the efforts of valor and endurance of the brave troops of the Carolinas and Georgia, aided by those of Delaware, Virginia, and Maryland, were unable to stop the progress of the British arms; when after many hard-fought battles, after meeting resolutely every hardship and suffering of fatigue and distention, still the cause of freedom and independence was fast sinking low: when the British army had nearly overrun those States, and the stern and hitherto invincible Cornwallis, at the head of a superior veteran army, carried fire and sword throughout Virginia also; and the Southern Indians, moved by British influence, were mustering their savage warriors to add their cruel hostilities to the calamities of the devoted South; if we revert back to that precise period of time, in which a numerous band of hostile Creeks, under Guristorsigo, had secretly and unknown to the unsuspecting inhabitants, penetrated into the heart of the country, and were ready, at the instigation of the British, to burst upon them with all the atrocities of their savage warfare.

If we look then at a certain part of South Carolina, we will see a large and veteran force about to conclude their day's march. They have marched apparently a long distance. They have suffered apparently extreme hardship; and we can see in the war-worn countenances of the tired and drooping soldiers that the thoughts of encampment and repose are sweet to them.

The appearance of a uniform is that of the American army. They also bear the American standard. Who are those men? They are the troops of the line of old Pennsylvania, ever faithful and true in the time of danger. And they have come, with the gallant Wayne at their head, all the way from that distant State. They have marched many hundreds of miles, and they have suffered every privation of a long, toilsome, and difficult route. And they are about to take their stand beside the men of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware, to assist the troops and people of the far South in their desperate struggle for freedom, for property, and for life. They encamp, and night soon closes

the scene. And soon, except the occasional voice of the sentinels, all is still and hushed in repose. But suddenly, at dead of night, arises a sound which seems to pierce and make shudder the earth, the woods and the sky. The shrieks of ten thousand furies, joined with the scream of ten thousand panthers of the forest, could not produce sounds more fierce, more wild, and more appalling. It is a sound which no civilized men can ever utter, which no civilized men can ever hear and mistake. Simultaneously, bright is the flash and deafening the report of countless rifles, and the tramp of men, and we know at once that the sleeping American camp is suddenly assaulted by a large force of hostile Indians. Will those brave men, thus taken unawares, fall victims to their fierce and wily assailants? No. Their terrific war cries may appal the timid, but they only fire the blood of the brave. The whites spring to their arms with a shout of surprise, and bursting from their tents, instantly strike at their enemies with swords and bayonets. Officers rush, sword in hand, to every point of danger, encourage their men, and lead into the fight. But prompt, and confident, and loud, amidst the uproar, are heard the orders of Wayne and his staff. Ready and bold are the answering shouts of the men. Order is soon given to the fierce, tumultuous fight. A skilful movement, which none but veteran valor could plan and execute at such a moment, instantly hem in the more daring enemies, with their leader, who had penetrated the camp, and at the same time attacks and presses hard on the rest. And now the sounds soon heard from the field of battle tell us that the whites, their blood up, towering high, are giving the swarthy ruffians the chastisement they so richly deserved.

The morning sun finds the Indian fugitives far away on their rapid flight, panic struck, back to their dismal wilds, whence they had issued at British instigation to slaughter the unsuspecting, defenceless people of the South. And in the centre of the camp, stretched on their backs, grim and motionless, lie Günstersgo and his most desperate savages, and still in their hands their useless rifles. Also then tomahawks—those tomahawks which but for the timely arrival of these brave men would so soon have been red with the blood of every age and sex. But Wayne and his men shed heavily a soldier's tear over their fallen comrades. And leaving their wounded to the tender care of delicate ladies, who came from all sides with their children, in grateful tears to thank their brave defenders, they hasten on with renewed ardor to join the rest of our army. Of their services afterwards to terminate the Southern war, it is not necessary here to speak—not of those before or elsewhere—not

now their first arrival and junction with Lafayette in Virginia first turned the tide of victory in our favor. It is familiar to every American acquainted with the history of his country. It is unnecessary to relate them here; neither is it necessary here to relate how the whole Northern army bore down rapidly into Virginia, with Washington at their head, and joining them, the troops under Lafayette and those under Rochambeau, our French ally, put a stop to the marauding operations of Cornwallis, and virtually to the war, by capturing that officer and all his army at Yorktown. It is too well known in every particular to every American. Suffice it to say that the battle here described, if not the last nor the first, appears to be considered one of the least of the services rendered by this particular corps alone, in assisting the Southern people to change and reverse the sad picture of their affairs before presented to view.

But it may be said that perhaps the present generation have different sentiments and different feelings; that those early times of pure, devoted patriotism, tried in the common affliction and suffering, like gold in the fire, have ceased to be.

And now our great Republic is troubled, and in constant dread of the phantom of abolition; that it comes to her like the spectre which confronted the Roman patriot, while pondering at midnight over the prospects of his country, and ever says with menacing aspect: I am thy evil genius; I will meet you to your doom on the first day of peril to the South, and that shall be your field of Philippi. But can we not now say that field of Philippi has come and gone; and victory, which deserted and felled the standard of republican Rome, has borne aloft our star-spangled banner.

The Mexican war, what was it but the touchstone of Northern patriotism? And did not the North ring true in that war? It was a war in which the South only was exposed, in which the South, we may almost say, was alone concerned. It was a war against a nation, abolitionist enough to delight Mr. Garrison, colored enough to satisfy the fastidious tastes of Mr. Gerritt Smith.

Long had the North listened to the voice of boastful abolition; to its seductive, plausible words, well capable, if not designed, to excite variance between the North and South. And the North listened in silence, and we began to think the North was alienated.

Yet in that war, at the first cry of danger, at the first call for help, she instantly stamped her heel on the neck of prostrate abolition, and rushed to the assistance of the South. I assert that the solicitations of the Northern militia to be allowed to

fight in that war, fairly embarrassed the Executive of the country. It was not only the troops of Louisiana, of Mississippi, of Texas that must be refused; not alone those of Arkansas, of South Carolina, of Tennessee; not alone of Maryland, of Missouri, of Kentucky, and the whole South; but, also, those of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and the whole North-west, and those of Pennsylvania, New York, and the whole North. Even distant Massachusetts must be allowed to send her regiment. I assert again, that the Executive was embarrassed by the solicitations of the Northern volunteers to be allowed to fight in that war: one calculated, in every particular, to test them on that point. The enthusiasm was universal: and, had hostilities continued much longer, I have little doubt that two regiments of bold New-Englanders might have been seen on their way to the field of battle—Mr. Garrison being at the head of one, with Messrs. Hale and Severance for field officers, and Mr. Gerritt Smith at the head of the other, with Messrs. Palfry and Giddings as field officers, and all clamorous for an opportunity to inflict destruction on the swarthy abolitionists of Mexico.

Considering these things, it appears impossible that any will assert that there is any consideration connected with the Free-Soil and rendition questions, or any feeling existing in any part of our country, either existing previously or engendered by them, or any intrinsic difficulty belonging to them, calculated to prevent or disturb a settlement of them on just, national, and statesmanlike principles. That our statesmen have on these questions a clear field; and, if they act with the judgment that has so long and so eminently distinguished them, a quiet and lasting settlement of these questions is inevitable.

And now, gentlemen of the North, before I conclude this very imperfect address, I desire to make some further remarks, of a nature, or for an object, somewhat different from that which has prompted the preceding—for an object somewhat personal to myself. I have endeavored to treat this question fairly and logically throughout, and I will frankly say I think we of the South understand it better than you. You, no doubt think differently. But experience is the best teacher in all cases, and circumstances, beyond our control have forced upon me and every Southern man a deep consideration of this question, in all its bearings. It cannot but be familiar to us all, and it deeply concerns us. And I, therefore, feel satisfied that the views which I have expressed are just and well founded throughout, that a just national, and statesmanlike settlement of the Free-Soil and rendition questions, and the principles which lead to it, are such as I have stated. But it will be observed that in

these remarks I have not made the admission which Southern men sometimes make, and which Northern men always seem to expect, that slavery is wrong in the abstract, and only to be justified by uncontrollable circumstances. I have not said so, because I do not think so. I have not learned to conceal my opinions. I have not bowed the knee to abolition. I have paid it no compliments, for I think it deserves none. Although advocated by many estimable citizens, of both the North and South, I consider it always erroneous and generally mischievous. And I have therefore endeavored to give reasons, which seem to me unanswerable, for a contrary course. But I know the inflexibility of prejudice, and I have not the vanity to suppose that any attempt of mine, feeble as it must necessarily be, will succeed to remove it: will avail to make the truth on this subject palatable to minds from which inveterate prejudice has long banished it. But, on the contrary, I know that any exposure of errors long held and cherished, however clear, however forcible, has no effect in general but to convey an unfavorable impression of him who makes it. And although we of the South regard but little the opinions of selfish, canting Europeans, we are not, and cannot be indifferent to those of our fellow-citizens and countrymen of the Northern States of this Union. Their approbation, their good opinion is very, very dear to us. For we feel assured that whatever their views on the subject of abolition may be, yet, with few exceptions, they would abhor to use any dishonorable, any unpatriotic means to promote them; that they will refrain from any vexatious, any ungenerous course towards the South, and will ever ring true in any case of difficulty and danger in which the South is involved. We would fain, then, before we conclude, advert to some other considerations to impress you that this subject, with us, also deeply concerns the feelings of the heart as well as the opinions of the head; considerations which seem to me more likely to meet with a response in your own bosoms.

In some parts of the North you have what is called Forefathers' Day, a day which you devote, annually, to the memory of your ancestors, (the brethren of ours,) and a grateful celebration of their first arrival and settlement in this country. And it always seemed to me a beautiful custom, and one to which I could wish we of the South had something similar. We owe much to our ancestors: not only the transmission of life, but of most that makes life desirable. Besides, any thing, as has been observed by a distinguished moralist, that diverts the thoughts of man from the present, and directs them to the future or the past, elevates him in the scale of rational beings and removes

to honor the memory of the latter creation—and it is pleasing to me to know that the people of all parts of the North are inclined to honor their ancestors and cherish their memory. And, think you, that we of the South have no such sentiment—no such feeling. The South is as ancient as the North, and can boast of American ancestors, in its opinion, no less noble—no less meritorious. And many of us can revert back more than two hundred years, in reminiscences and traditions, which connect us with American ancestors—men of elevated sentiments and honorable character—men who served their country in every period, in every difficulty, whether at the North or South, whether in the council or the field, and were good citizens, good neighbors and good men—but they were slaveholders.

From them some of us have derived not only life, but property, originally obtained by slave labor, and now so maintained. And with many of us it would be the case, that if all the members of a numerous connection who are slaveholders, or connected with slavery, were not in life, we could then say with Logan: "there is not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature." Gentlemen of the North, I feel that you expect too much of us if you expect us to profess abolition. I feel that I cannot consent to stake soft in this battle. A Southern man fights now, in every sense *pro aris et focis*, and in such a conflict can neither give nor take quarter. He has too much at stake. Nor should you expect him to "pout you as gently as the sucking dove" on the subject of abolition. And have you no sentiments in your own bosoms that would lead you to regret that he should do otherwise. One-half of your country is slaveholding, and will, probably from choice, and certainly from necessity, forever so continue. Are you willing that obloquy should be cast on any part of your country? I do not come now to question your patriotism; for, if I understand you aright, it is of a stamp to force you to side with your country right or wrong. A number of her most influential and eminent statesmen are slaveholders. How often have they, as well as other statesmen of our country, stepped forward in time of difficulty and saved the State from peril. And have you such confidence in obnoxious things as to think we shall never again require such services—and are you willing to see their influence lessened, and their power to breast the torrent of political trouble. But have you on the heart, no name written, as well as we, of the statesmen of the past, which you feel inclined to defend from stigma and reproach. Are we not all called the children of Washington. Is he not called the father of his country. The time was when throughout this wide world,

every American stood erect when his name was heard. But he was a slaveholder: deriving descent from a long line of forefathers who were slaveholders. And the time is now at hand, if the spirit of abolition prevails, when we must hang the head at the name of Washington. And who require us to do this? Men who come here reeking from the corruptions of Europe—moral, political, and social—to teach morality and religion to the enlightened and virtuous citizens of this great Republic.

ERRATA.

- Page 6** Fourth line of 4th paragraph, for Landas read Landers.
12 Second line from bottom, for "they would" read they should, &c.
13 17th line, for "consideration" read examination.
16 22d line, the sentence commencing thus, "Besides, the word *service*, as distinguished from labor and *discharged*, appears," should read as follows, Besides the words *service* (as distinguished from labor) and *discharged*, appear," &c. In the same page, 10th line from the bottom, the first word, "national," should be mutual.
24 7th line, for "unless authorized," read unless so authorized.
25 9th line from bottom, for "offered," read afforded.
31 13th line, for "in consequence of certain abolitionists," read, in consequence of the perversions of certain abolitionists. 4th line, same page, for "North," read South.

W46





